

IN THE DRAWINGS

Applicants have discovered a mistake in Fig. 8 of the drawings. Subject to the approval of the Examiner, numeral "96" should be added to a feature in Fig. 8 by substituting a new sheet of drawings. The feature is described in the specification at P. 7, lines 3-5. A separate letter to the official draftsperson is enclosed, amending Fig. 8 to make these corrections. No new matter has been added in making these changes. The Examiner is requested to approve the changes and to enter the amendment.

REMARKS

1. Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).
2. The Examiner has rejected Claims 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 3,476,161 to L.E. Dunlap ("Dunlap") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,599,018 to Quentin Woods ("Woods"). Dunlap is directed to a tool guide support and saw guard for a power saw. The Examiner states that Dunlap teaches a "router apparatus" with a "guide," and a "platform." The Examiner further states that the "router" is one "having a vertical adjustment" and an end mill cutter therein provided on the "platform." The Examiner avers that while the "guide" in Dunlap is not fastened to the workpiece by fasteners drilled through the skin, one possessing ordinary skill in the related art would be expected to readily adapt known fastening means as taught by Woods wherein fasteners attach a "guide" to a workpiece surface to modify the attachment means of Dunlap. Woods is directed to an automatic traversing drilling unit and method of using.

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 12-21 on the grounds that the combination of references is improper, that the combination does not have a reasonable expectation of success, and that the combination of references does not describe or suggest all the limitations of the inventions of Claims 12-21. M.P.E.P. § 2142 at 2100-121. There is no motivation to combine Dunlap, directed to a tool guide support for a power saw, with Woods, directed to an automatic traversing drilling unit. The two references are such that they cannot be combined, since they cover completely different subject matters. Even combined, the two references do not teach the present invention, which is directed to an aircraft skin router apparatus. Claim 12, for instance,